

Some of the points made by Mr. Eley seem to me to warrant further discussion, for which I hope you may be able to find space.

1. What is the evidence that "imagination is most active in highly strung neurotic people and . . . highly strung states"? This may be true of certain types (and perhaps the most valuable types) of imagination, but I should be glad to know of any evidence that it is true of imagination in general.

2. Mr. Eley seems to assume that the "men of high intellect" whom he has observed to be "overpressed and overworked" are so because of a shortage of British citizens of equivalent intelligence. My impression, however, is that fairly reliable evidence indicates that we have in Britain a large reservoir of high intellect at present largely untapped. Am I wrong in this impression?

3. Can we "all think of races appreciably better equipped than ourselves in those respects" (*i.e.* intelligence)? Putting aside the debatable use of the word "races" in this sense and speaking of "nations" (which the context implies), what is the evidence that the British as a nation are less well equipped with intelligence than other nations? My impression is that evidence from America (so far as it is reliable, which one may doubt) indicates the contrary. If, however, there is evidence to support Mr. Eley's contention, I should be most interested to hear of it.

4. Why should the people who are to "perform the innumerable dull routine services" of society be of only "moderate intelligence" and have "not too much imagination"? Might not a little more intelligence and imagination and a little less traditionalism render the jobs of those who "mine coal, sweep streets, plough the land" and so on less "manual and unpleasant"?

I assure you, Sir, that I have no wish to quibble, but I feel strongly that any programme of eugenics should be based on ascertained fact.

69 Manor Road, CYRIL BIBBY.
Chipping Barnet, Herts.

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—To deal with Mr. Bibby's points in order.

1. My evidence is drawn from observation—of myself and others—and from the statements of others. It has led me to conclude that periods or moments of contented stability are not those in which creative and imaginative activity normally occur. Like Mr. Bibby, I would welcome any fresh light on the subject.

2. My statement was factual and based on observation in my daily life. I hope that Mr. Bibby may be right in his contrary impressions, but I have seen no indication of any large untapped reservoir of high intellect in this country. The difficulty I have encountered and often heard discussed is that of finding people of adequate ability to perform the more exacting jobs. I am also always being told how much diluted—as com-

pared to pre-war—have become the standards of ability of the different grades in the Civil Service. This is certainly not due to lack of diligence in hunting for candidates by the Establishment Branches or to any acquiescence on their part in lower standards. It appears to arise from the great expansion in the requirements of the Civil Service and the impossibility of finding enough candidates of the standard they would wish to have. They would welcome a contact with Mr. Bibby's pool.

3. My evidence is drawn from my own observation and from the statements of others. In my contribution to the Symposium I quoted the opinions expressed by a number of eminent men about the outstanding characteristics of the English. None of them suggested that we were an intellectual people.

I do not think, for instance, that most observers with a real knowledge of the two nations would consider that the average Englishman has the same intellectual equipment as the average Frenchman. Personally, I have no doubt that a French taxi driver, for example, is enormously more active mentally than an English one. I also know that I would sooner be driven down the Champs Elysées by an English driver!

4. This is a question of degree and experiment. My reasons for thinking that we should not wish to have people in any field who were radically too intelligent for the work they had to perform were indicated in the earlier part of my contribution. Probably Mr. Bibby and I are not far apart, if at all. He asks for "a little more intelligence and imagination." If he means "a little more than is at present found on the average in England" I am with him; but I am sure that more of either quality than could be satisfied in the field that was open to it would result in distress and inefficiency.

In conclusion, I am in entire agreement with Mr. Bibby that we cannot be too careful in questioning and testing any statements about facts that may be made the basis for forming policy or taking action. In this I agree with the statement of Oliver Cromwell with which I concluded my contribution; but a Society like ours has to make up its mind on policy and action on the best information available to it. I am not quite sure what Mr. Bibby means by his reference to "ascertained fact." Would he cut out all evidence that does not spring from formal research work? I do not imagine so. There are many things that we know—without even having to imagine them—and on which we would all agree to base action without even suggesting that we should attempt to have our knowledge scientifically proved.

GEOFFREY ELEY.

1 Pembroke Villas, W.8.

Assortative Mating

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—It is worth mentioning that Professor Haldane's suggestion for testing Freud's theory of choice of spouse has already occurred to a few